REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated June 13, 2005 in which the Examiner rejected claims 18-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

As indicated above, claims 18 and 23 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and does not narrow the literal scope of the claims.

Claim 18 claims a printer control device for controlling a printer and claim 23 claims a method for controlling a printer. The device and method provide a user with an option to select one of a) at least one security code is required for both first printing of print data and a reprinting of the print data and b) the at least one security code is required only for the reprinting of the print data.

Through the structure and method of the claimed invention providing a user with an option to select one of a) at least one security code is required for both printing and reprinting and b) the at least one security code is required only for reprinting as claimed in claims 18 and 23, the claimed invention provides an apparatus and method which allows printed matter to be obtained more quickly while securing confidentiality of the printing data. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 18 and 23.

Claims 18-21, 23-26, 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Mori* (U.S. Patent No. 6,089,765).

Mori appears to disclose a printing system in which print data created by an application program and transferred to a printer is stored and managed in a print data storage device, providing that the print data is authorized for reprinting. A printer monitor is provided to constantly monitor the printer for a request to retransmit data

VA 783831.1

that has already been printed. When such a retransmission request from the printer is detected, the print data requested for retransmission is specified in the print data storage device and is transmitted to the printer for reprinting. (abstract) As shown in FIG. 3, the printer control portion 31 of the printer 10 is constructed from: a CPU 11 for controlling the entire printer 10; a ROM 12 used to store various control programs such as a main control program and print programs (printer controller 31) shown in FIGS. 7 and 8; a RAM 13 including various buffers for temporarily storing print data transmitted from the computer 20 and storing a printer job management table T2 (which will be described later); a control unit 17 for enabling the user to input commands such as a reprint command; a liquid crystal display 18 (hereinafter referred to as a LCD 18) for displaying a list of reprintable print data in the printer job management table T2; a print mechanism 16 for printing on a recording medium according to the transmitted print data; a driver circuit 15 for communicating with the print mechanism 16; and various sensors 14. (col. 3, lines 14-29) It may also be possible to prohibit non-specific users from reprinting a document by requiring the user in S30 to input his/her password or the like. In this case, for example, if the determination made in S30 is negative, the CPU 21 adds the header data with: data indicating that the print data is restricted from reprinting; and the user's inputted password data. The printer 10 will display that the subject print data is restricted from reprinting and can be reprinted only when the appropriate password is inputted. (col. 12, lines 26-34)

Thus, *Mori* merely discloses requiring a user to input a password to reprint a document. Nothing in *Mori* shows, teaches or suggests a user selects one of a) at least one security code is required for both printing and reprinting and b) the at least

one security code only required for reprinting as claimed in claims 18 and 23. Rather, *Mori* merely discloses requiring a security code for reprinting (i.e., *Mori* does not have a user select one of two options).

Since nothing in *Mori* shows, teaches or suggests having a user select one of a) at least one security code required for both first printing and reprinting of print data and b) the at least one security code is required only for reprinting of print data, as claimed in claims 18 and 23, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 19-21, 24-26 and 28-32 depend from claims 18 and 23 and recite additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-21, 24-26 and 28-32 would not have been anticipated by *Mori* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 19-21, 24-26 and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 18, 22-23, 27-28 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Manchala et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,119).

Manchala et al appears to disclose building a destroyer or check shredder into the printer. This device scans the printed information on the check (the layout and content of this information is explained later) and shreds the check before enabling a reprint of the check. It is possible for someone to print the relevant information on a separate piece of paper, pass that through the shredder, and reprint another check. To prevent this possibility, a magnetic strip is provided on the check. This must also be read by the shredder and the strip information must verify the printed information before a new check can be printed. (col. 1, lines 53-63) Authentication between the

shredder and the AA server is normally not provided by the operating system because of the difficulty in installing a client version of the operating system on the print service. Difficulty arises because the print service has real time needs for printing, and also because of limited size/space of disk storage and the need to have a separate processor for the operating system. For this reason, a hand shake mechanism between the shredder (part of the print service) and the AA service similar to the one used in Novell Netware 3.0 was devised. This is explained in FIG. 7, and essentially is step 2 of FIG. 6. The operator logs in using his/her user name ("Alice"), id and password on the shredder (part of the print service). The shredder sends the login name to the AA server. The AA server knows a quantity X which was a precomputed hash of the operator's password and salt. Standard hashing functions like MD2/5 or SHA could be used for this purpose. It picks a random challenge R and sends it along with the salt to the shredder. The shredder computes a hash of the password and salt sent from the AA server, and forms X', which should equal X. It then calculates Y' which is a hash of X' and the random challenge sent by the AA server. The AA server also performs the same operation on its side and calculates Y. This should equal Y' calculated by the shredder. When the shredder sends in Y' across to the AA server, the server compares this quantity with its calculated value of Y and if it satisfies the equality, confirms the operator to be allowed to proceed to step 63 of FIG. 6. In the case of MICR printing, the application client is a graphical user interface that leads from a login/password session to a screen of data containing data items like name of the operator, name of the payee, amount, data, address of the payee, MICR line contents, check number, job number and the no-print flag. The no-print flag is initially off and is switched on (enabled) when a check

VA 783831.1

is printed. It is disabled again after the check has been destroyed. This can be shown in a window as an up/down flag. The application server is a database containing several records, only one of which can be seen at a time using the client application. Before the application client can print a check, it needs to connect with the application database. This set of steps is shown in FIG. 8. 81. When the application server starts on Host 2, it automatically stores information about its network address in the DCE directory service. 82. An operator on Host 1 logs in, and the user's process gets authentication (security context), storing it for later use. 83. When the operator starts the application on Host 1, the application uses the DCE client software to search the directory service for information about the location of the application server. The directory service returns the application server information to the application client. 84. The application client uses the information from the directory service to communicate with the application server. The application client uses the user's authentication information to prove its identity to the application server. (col. 4, line 36 through col. 5, line 25)

Thus *Manchala et al* merely discloses for printing, a login/password section is used. Nothing in *Manchala et al* shows, teaches or suggests a user selects one of a) at least one security code required for both first printing and reprinting and b) the at least one security code is required only for reprinting as claimed in claims 18 and 23. Rather, *Manchala et al* merely discloses using a security code for reprinting.

Since nothing in *Manchala et al* shows, teaches or suggests having a user select one of two options as claimed in claims 18 and 23, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

VA 783831.1

Claims 22, 27-28 and 32 depend from claims 18 and 23 and recite additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22, 27-28 and 32 would not have been anticipated within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by *Manchala et al* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 22, 27-28 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner enters this Amendment for purposes of appeal.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

VA 783831.1

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge

our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: __September 13, 2005__   By: _____
Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

VA 783831.1